
Recent Exemplifications of False Philology

Hall Fizedward

Title: Recent Exemplifications of False Philology

Author: Hall Fitzedward

This is an exact replica of a book. The book reprint was manually improved by a team of professionals, as opposed to automatic/OCR processes used by some companies. However, the book may still have imperfections such as missing pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. that were a part of the original text. We appreciate your understanding of the imperfections which can not be improved, and hope you will enjoy reading this book.



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1872, by
SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, PRINTERS, BUNGAY.

There is scarce any truth, but its adversaries have made it an ugly vizard, by which it 's exposed to the hate and disesteem of superficial examiners. For an opprobrious title, with vulgar believers, is as good as an argument.
Joseph Glanvill.

“I AM a woman of an unspotted reputation,” protests the ancient Clelia,¹ “and know nothing I have ever done which should encourage such insolence; but here was one, the other day,—and he was dressed like a gentleman, too,—who took the liberty to name the words *lusty fellow* in my presence.”

It is because this lady ventured and failed, that she is now recalled from the past. The peculiar sphere of her one recorded censure, and its miscarriage, taken conjointly with her antiquity, determine for her a memorable position, if not an importance, in literary history. Of the rabble of verbal critics, English and American, we must acknowledge her, unquestionably, as the classical prototype.

In these latter days, the propagation of our vernacular philology is, for the most part, after this wise. The critic-aster, having looked for a given expression, or sense of an expression, in his dictionary, but without finding it there, or even without this preliminary toil, conceives it to be novel, unauthorized, contrary to analogy, vulgar, superfluous, or what not. Flushed with his precious discovery, he explodes it before the public. Universal shallowness wonders and applauds; and Aristarchus the Little, fired to dare fresh achievements, is certain of new weeds to wreath with his deciduous bays.

Unless we suppose that the patron of a whim is subconscious of the real nature of his pet, it is not easy to

¹ *Spectator*, No. 276. Possibly, Clelia had been reading the pious Edward Terry, and had borrowed from him her notion of the meaning of *lusty*. See *A Voyage to East-India* (ed. 1655), p. 147.

account for the fact, that he confines himself but rarely to calm statement or argument. Defect of substantial reasons must be compensated somehow; and no compensation for it is more obvious, or is oftener called into play, than an air of impatient contempt towards those who disrelish ipse-dixitism.

With thus much of preface, I proceed to give illustrations of the style and temper of philologizing characterized above. Some of these illustrations are drawn, to be sure, from the works of writers to whom we are indebted for most sagacious and valuable remarks on our language. But, the greater our obligations to such writers, the more desirable is it that their invalid judgments should be discriminated from their valid. As for mere sciolists, to subject one of their number to a strict appreciation may operate, let it be hoped, as a salutary warning.

“In our own age,” says Walter Savage Landor,¹ “many, Burke among the rest, say ‘by *this* means’. It would be affectation to say ‘by *this mean*’, in the singular; but the proper expression is ‘by *these means*’.”

From the time of Shakespeare downwards, there are few writers but have employed the substantive *means* as a singular;² and, for a long time, it was, in the use of many, convertible with *mean*.³ Even Dr. Johnson has “*this means*”,⁴ though he tells us, with reference to *mean*: “It is often used in the plural, and, by some, not very grammatically, with an adjective singular.” “*This mean*” is

¹ *Last Fruit off an Old Tree*, p. 104. Bp. Lowth, in his *Grammar*, after quoting “by *this means*” from the Bible, and “by *that means*” from Atterbury, asks: “Ought it not to be ‘by *these means*’, ‘by *those means*’? Or ‘by *this mean*’, ‘by *that mean*’, in the singular number, as it is used by Hooker, Sidney, Shakespeare, &c.?”

² Addison always writes “*this means*”, for the singular; and so almost everybody has written since the beginning of the last century.

³ Capgrave, *Chronicle of England* (1464), pp. 176, 241, 258, 294, 295, 300, 352, 365. Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Governour* (1531), fol. 15, 42, 49, 70, 75, 135, 146, 150, 164 (ed. 1580). *Pasquine in a Trance* (ed. 1566), fol. 5, 11, 13, 30, 33, 71, &c. Barnabe Riche, *Farewell to Militarie Profession* (1581), pp. 10, 47, 62, 101, 116, 145, &c. (ed. 1846). Thomas Coghlan, *Haven of Health* (1586), chapters 203, 242. Shakespeare, *Winter's Tale*, Act 4, Scene 3. William Watson, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions* (1602), pp. 60, 62, 105, 149. Samuel Hieron, *Works* (ed. 1624), Vol. 1, pp. 9, 88. James Hayward, *Banish'd Virgin* (1635), pp. 114, 140. Matthew Lawrence, *Use and Practice of Faith* (1657), pp. 22, 106, 130, 131. Barrow, *Works* (ed. 1683), Vol. 2, pp. 65, 134, 377. Steele, *Spectator*, Nos. 4, 394, 450.

⁴ *Adventurer*, No. 39.

of frequent occurrence in the pages of Coleridge and his imitators.

According to Landor, if we wish to speak of one out of several *means*, we may not, in propriety, even resort to a periphrasis; ¹ we must express a plurality, though we intend only a unity. In preference to what is assumed to be bad grammar, on the one hand, and in preference to an affectation, on the other hand, we are counselled to elect a misrepresentation of our meaning. That “this *mean*” is an affectation, just as “this *remain*” would be, is admitted; but that “this *means*” is ungrammatical postulates a criterion of grammaticalness other than the sole rational criterion, general consent.²

¹ Gray,—see his *Works* (ed. Mitford, 1858), Vol. 5, p. 208,—commenting, in 1760, on Walpole's *Lives of the Painters*, has the following criticism: “*Geniuses*. There is no such word; and *genii* means something else.” Here we are denied a plural. Gray's contemporaries were not, however, so finical as himself, and used *geniuses* freely. I name a few of them. Tilson, Cambridge, J. G. Cooper, and Anon., *World*, Nos. 67, 119, 159, 152, 171. Colman and Thornton, *Connoisseur*, Nos. 19, 28, 47, 54, 70, 72, 139. Richardson, *Correspondence*, Vol. 4, p. 138. Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. 2, ch. 19; *Sermons*, No. 42. Miss Carter, *Letters to Miss Talbot*, &c., Vol. 3, p. 165. Jones, of Nayland, *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. 5, p. 403. Even Glanvill, in the *Address to the Royal Society*, prefixed to his *Scepſis Scientifica* (ed. 1665), has *geniuses*; and in his *Sadducismus Triumphatus* (ed. 1726), p. 451. And so has Addison, in his remarks on Pavia, Milan, &c., in his *Travels*. In his *Dialogues on Medals*, however, he uses *genies*.

² Perhaps “*a means*” sprang from an old oblique case, if it did not originate with the vulgar: compare their *ways*, in “*a great ways off*”. And so, it may be, we came by our singular *pains*, as in “*much pains is necessary*”.

But the singular *means* has other parallels.

Amends. Bp. Pecoock, *Repressor*, (1456), p. 110. Barrow, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 41. Addison, *Spectator*, No. 530. Hughes, *Spectator*, No. 311. Southey, *Life and Correspondence*, Vol. 5, p. 86. I might add references to Lyly, Gabriell Harvey, Hobbes, Milton, Jeremy Collier, and Burke.

Assizes. Henry More, *Mystery of Godliness* (ed. 1660), p. 225. Addison, *Guardian*, No. 105. De Foe's *Political History of the Devil* (ed. 1840), p. 222 (in a quotation). Charles Johnson, *Chrysal* (ed. 1777), Vol. 2, p. 90. Lord Macaulay, *Essay on Warren Hastings*.

News, now a singular, was, originally, a plural; and modern usage sanctions, to some extent, the plural *newses*.

News, to be compared with the French *nouvelles*, has long been, optionally, a singular.

Stews is singular in Raphe Robynson's translation of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1551), p. 43 (ed. 1869); in Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse* (1579), pp. 66, 68 (ed. 1868); and in Lyly's *Euphuus* (1579-80), p. 43 (ed. 1868).

Add *odds*, with *ethics*, *politics*, *physics*, *mathematics*, *mechanics*, and many other names of sciences, now singular.

Alms, *bellows*, *jakes*, and *summons* owe their plural aspect to mere corruption; and such is the case with *riches*, which once was of either number. A

Yet it is Landor who lays down, that "one rash decision ruins the judge's credit, which twenty correcter never can restore."

"The epithet 'church-going', applied to a bell, and that by so chaste a writer as Cowper, is an instance of the strange abuses which poets have introduced into their language, till they and their readers take them as matters of course, if they do not single them out expressly as objects of admiration."

It is the poet Wordsworth¹ that thoughtlessly comments thus, by the term "epithet" begging the whole question. Instead of "church-going bell", Cowper ought to have written "churchgoing-bell". "Churchgoing" is here a substantive; and the expression arraigned as an "abuse" stands on the same footing with the elliptical "drinking-cup", "laughing-gas", "riding-whip", "stumbling-block",² "walking-stick", "watering-pot", "wedding-garment".

like corruption is seen in *gallows*, for which Capgrave has *galow*; while Henry Earl of Monmouth, in his *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1656), has the plural *gallowesses* repeatedly. So, too, has John Taylor, the water-poet, at an earlier date. *Shambles* is, as in Shakespeare, singular in Lord Macaulay: see his *Essay on Sir James Mackintosh*. Nash, in his *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem*, has *shamble*. *Tidings* is singular in Gosson's *School of Abuse*, p. 47; *thanks*, in John Taylor's *Works* (ed. 1630), Vol. 2, p. 170, and in Dr. Donne's *Polydoron* (1631), p. 171. "An ephemerides." Burton and Fuller. Addison, in the first of his *Dialogues on Medals*, has "a tattered colours."

Wage might, also, here be remarked on, with the old *victual*, and the comparatively modern *material* and *orgy*. The last is as old as Addison: see the *Spectator*, No. 217. "One *armes*", meaning 'weapon', is found in *Pasquine in a Traunce*, fol. 84; and "an *armes*", in Henry Lawrence's *Of our Communion and Warre with Angels* (1646), p. 172.

Corps, for 'body', whether in its primary sense or in its derivative, was long used as a plural, simply because of its ending in *s*. "All the *corps* of Chrystendome . . . have lyved." Sir Thomas More, *Apologye* (1533), fol. 70. Also see Bp. Pearson, *An Exposition of the Creed* (1659), p. 572 (ed. 1845). *Corps* is still the form there found, but for 'dead body.' John Taylor, a generation before, has *corpse*, in the same sense, and as a plural. *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 299. And so has Fuller.

In the last century, if not a little sooner, arose the vulgar *chay*, from the notion that *choise* was a plural. Then, too, likewise judging by the ear, the uneducated considered *pulse* as a plural, and said "his pulse *are* weak". The singular, if used, must have been, to them, *pul*.

Kicksheads, a barbarization of *quelque chose*, and a plural in virtue of its sound to vulgar ears, has acquired a singular number.

¹ *Poetical Works* (ed. 1846), Vol. 2, p. 342.

² Mr. Marsh—*Lectures on the English Language*, p. 656, foot-note,—writes, not very wisely: "Query for the purists: Ought I rather to say, a 'block-that-is-being-stumbled-at'?" He fails to see that the first factor of 'stumbling-block' is static, and, consequently, is no longer a participle.

Referring to the word *atonement*, as being explainable by 'a being at one', Coleridge annotates:

"This is a mistaken etymology, and, consequently, a dull, though unintentional, pun. Our *atone* is, doubtless, of the same stock with the Teutonic *aussöhnen*, *versöhnen*; the Anglo-Saxon taking the *t* for the *s*."¹

From the air of confidence with which this is said, one would think there must be good foundation for it. On the contrary, it is utterly untenable. *At one*, for 'reconciled', is as old as Roberd Mannyng: "make an *onement* with God", "set *at onement*"², are expressions of the sixteenth century; and I am not aware that *atonement* and *atone* are of an earlier date.³ Further, *atonement* seems to have preceded *atone*. The latter nowhere occurs in the Bible.

"I believe you will very rarely find, in any great writer before the Revolution, the possessive case of an inanimate noun used, in prose, instead of the dependent case; as, 'the watch's hand', for 'the hand of the watch'. The possessive, or Saxon genitive, was confined to persons, or, at least, to animated subjects."

Thus Coleridge again.⁴ Yet, even in our Bible and Prayer-book, there are such phrases as "day's journey", "stomach's sake", and "wit's end", with "body's", "eye's", "gospel's", "heaven's", "hope's", "love's", "lucre's", "mercy's", "name's", "oath's", "temple's", "thing's", "tooth's", "truth's", "word's", "work's", &c. &c.; and it may be thought sufficient if I adduce like expressions from Sir Thomas Elyot,⁵ Bishop Sanderson,⁶

¹ *Statesman's Manual*, Appendix A, foot-note.

"You may understand, by *insect*," says Coleridge, in his *Table-talk*, "life in sections"—diffused generally over the parts." Much in like manner, you may understand, with Joe Miller, *woman* to be made up of *wo* and *man*. An *insect* is so called from the *insections*, 'creases', which characterize its physical structure.

² Burthogge, in his *Causa Dei* (1675), pp. 172-3, uses the word *atonable*, which is not in the dictionaries. "He, . . . by his obedience and death, hath rendred God *attonable* to man."

³ See *The Bible Word-Book*, pp. 42-44. That *one* was anciently pronounced with the vowel-sound of *o* is evident from *only*—formerly written *onely*—and *alone*. The latter word is even found for *all one*, 'all the same'. "It is *alone* as if the Apostle had said," &c. Hieron, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 525.

⁴ *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 181.

⁵ "Fortune's mutability", "bed's head". *The Governour*, fol. 95, 157.

⁶ "Life's", "town's", "merit's." *Sermons* (ed. 1681), Vol. 2, pp. 104, 184, 222.

Hobbes,¹ and Henry More.² As to awkward instances of such inflected forms as Coleridge thinks to be modern, I am convinced that they were much more common before the Revolution of 1688 than they have been since.³

“The author asks credit for his having, here and elsewhere, resisted the temptation of substituting *whose* for *of which*. The misuse of the said pronoun relative *whose*, where the antecedent neither is, nor is meant to be represented as, personal, or even animal, he would brand as one among the worst of those mimicries of poetic diction by which imbecile writers fancy they elevate their prose,—would, but that, to his vexation, he meets with it, of late, in the compositions of men that least of all need such artifices, and who ought to watch over the purity and privileges of their mother-tongue with all the jealousy of high-priests set apart, by nature, for the pontificate. Poor as our language is in terminations and inflections significant of the genders, to destroy the few it possesses is most wrongful.”

Coleridge, here cited once again,⁴ implies that he is deal-

¹ “Self-defence’s”, “contract’s”, “society’s”, “honour’s”, “city’s”. *Works* (ed. Sir W. Molesworth), Vol. 2, pp. 109, 110, 118, 223, 266.

² “Sun’s”, “moon’s”, “hypocrisy’s”, “soul’s.” *Mystery of Godliness*, pp. 344, 345, 385, 440.

³ Without interruption, we have had, from the days of Anglo-Saxon till the present time, such genitives as Coleridge objects to. Bp. Pecock, in his *Repressor*, pp. 31, 46, 48, &c., prefers “reason’s doom” to “doom of reason”. “Feet’s measures”, “summer’s day,” “the Chirchis bileevyng.” *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 89, 137.

We have been altogether capricious with respect to inserting the *s* of the genitive into compounds. Words like *beadsman*, *copestmate*, *cowslip*, *daisy*, and *daysman* are comparatively rare in Old English, while such as *herdman* are very numerous. Thomas Fuller, in his *Mixt Contemplations*, &c. (1660), 2, 2, ventured *seedtime*; but we cling to *seedtime*, though we say *seedsman*. Even *gownsmen* and *swordsmen* are modernish; *bridemaid* has only lately given place to *bridesmaid*; and *lifeguardmen* was used in 1756: *Connoisseur*, No. 118. *Cow-milk* and *hen-egg* were forms current in the sixteenth century, and perhaps afterwards. The latter of them was not too antique for Dr. Johnson, in his *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*.

The genitive case is found in *needs*, *now-a-days*, *always*, *sometimes*, &c. &c. Our *once*, of old written *ones*, is the genitive of *one*. Instead of ‘for the *nonce*’, we formerly wrote ‘for the *nones*’, in which *the nones* is a corruption of *then ones*; *then* being the old dative of *the*. A like instance of the provection of *n* is seen in the “*no nother* cause of varyaunce” of Sir Thomas More: *Apologye*, fol. 110. *Noun*, for *own*, occurs in Udal and in Otway; and Shakespeare, John Taylor, and Foote show that *uncle* was long depraved into *nuncle*.

⁴ *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare*, &c., Vol. 2, p. 354.

Dr. Johnson, in his *Grammar*, states that “*Whose* is rather the poetical than regular genitive of *which*.” Bp. Lowth says: “*Whose* is, by some authors, made the possessive case of *which*, and applied to things as well as

ing with a mode of expression which has only recently been authorized by good writers. Nevertheless, the use of *whose* for *of which*, where the antecedent is not only irrational but inanimate, has had the support of high authorities for several hundred years.¹

persons,—I think, improperly.” He then quotes Addison as writing: “Is there any other *doctrine whose* followers are punished?”

According to Mr. Marsh, in language which needs qualifying, “*Whose* was universally employed, as a neuter, by the best English writers, until a recent period, as, in certain combinations, it still is by very good authorities.” *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 396. And here I am anxious to confess that I have elsewhere mistaken and misquoted what Mr. Marsh there remarks about the expression “I passed a house *whose* windows were open.” If, however, “we should scruple to say” so, my argument is still unaffected.

Our *who* and *what* came from the Anglo-Saxon *hwa* and *hwæt*, which were only interrogative. Of both *hwa* and *hwæt* the genitive was *hwæs*, whence our *whose*, which, as a relative, is older than the relative *who*. *What*, as strictly equivalent to the relative *which*, never had much vogue, and has long been a vulgarism; but its genitive has survived, in preference to *whichs*, as we should have modernized the medieval *quhilkcs*.

Dean Alford, in *The Queen's English*, after asserting, much too roundly, that “both *who* and *which* are, in our older writers, used of persons,” asserts, that our ancestors, by their “Our Father *which* art in heaven,” intended “reference to the relationship, rather than to the Person only;” for “*who* merely identifies, whereas *which* classifies.” The fact is, that the translators of our Bible copied, as far as was practicable, the language of the versions which served as the groundwork of their labours; and that, in 1611, *who*, for *which* as a relative personal pronoun, was not yet thoroughly established. The distinction which the Dean takes is purely gratuitous.

¹ “Langagis *whos* reulis ben not writen.” Bp. Pecock, *Repressor*, Introduction, p. lxxxiv., foot-note. Also see pp. 10, 12, 32, 34, 40, 41, &c.

“He mad many bokis of this craft, *whos* names be these,” &c. Capgrave, *Chronicle of England*, p. 66.

But I must curtail my references. In those which follow, the words italicized have *whose* for their relative. *Rome, court.* Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Governour*, fol. 196, 197. *Vinegar.* Thomas Coghlan, *Haven of Health*, ch. 200. *Antiquity.* Gabriell Harvey, *Pierce's Supererogation* (1593), p. 184 (in *Archæica*, Vol. 2). *Things.* Hobbes, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 220. *Church.* Henry More, *Mystery of Iniquity* (ed. 1664), p. 541. *America, optics.* Joseph Glanvill, *Scep̄sis Scientīfica*, p. 132; *Plus Ultra* (1668), p. 46. *Things.* Bp. Sanderson, *Sermons*, Vol. 2, p. 152. *Anything.* Cambridge, *The World*, No. 102. *Age, function, wealth, performances.* Charles Johnson, *Chrysal*, Vol. 1, pp. 107, 196; Vol. 2, p. 154; Vol. 3, p. 204. *Trees.* Gray, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 55. *Field.* Miss Carter, *Letters to Mrs. Montagu*, Vol. 3, p. 22. *Gospel.* William Cowper, *Works* (ed. Southey, 1835—1837), Vol. 4, p. 310. *Bridge.* Southey, *Espriella's Letters*, Vol. 2, p. 267: also see *Letters*, &c. (1797), pp. 34, 62, 92. *Religion, melancholy, perception, columns, buildings, smoke, mountains, fruit, staircase, laurustinus, flowers, arches, power, pedestal, trees.* Shelley, *Essays*, &c., Vol. 1, pp. 34, 234, 242; Vol. 2, pp. 186, 189, 195, 197, 198, 201, 208, 268, 278. “*Work-shop.*” Dr. Arnold, *Life and Correspondence* (ed. 1846), p. 281. *Branch.* Mr. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, p. 4: and see pp. iv., 16, 17, 20, 34, 70, 99, 155, 157, 171, 197.

“The word *apartment*, meaning, in effect, a *compartment* of a house, already includes, in its proper sense, a suite of rooms; and it is a mere vulgar error, arising out of the ambitious usage of lodging-house keepers, to talk of one family or one establishment occupying *apartments*, in the plural. ‘The queen’s *apartment*’ at St. James’s, or at Versailles, not ‘the queen’s *apartments*’, is the correct expression.”

Thus dogmatizes that most wayward of triflers, Mr. Thomas De Quincey,¹ delivering himself in his peculiar manner, as if his own conviction of what is right were conclusive of the ignorance, snobbishness, idiocy, or some other equally deplorable defect, of all dissentients, that is to say, generally, of the world at large. And again:

“Our English use of the word *apartment* is absurd, since it leads to total misconceptions. We read, in French memoirs innumerable, of ‘the king’s *apartment*’, of ‘the queen’s *apartment*’, &c.; and, for us English, the question arises, How? had the king, had her Majesty, only one *room*? But, my friend, they might have a thousand *rooms*, and yet have only one *apartment*. An *apartment* means, in the continental use, a section or *compartment* of an edifice.”²

Nevertheless, Mr. De Quincey himself stoops, again and again, to “the ambitious usage of lodging-house keepers”, and falls into the “mere vulgar error” of using the plural *apartments* for ‘rooms’.³

The French *appartement* seems to have meant, originally, as it still continues often to mean, ‘a storey⁴ of a dwelling-house or the like’, and thence acquired the signification of ‘a suite of rooms’; these being restricted, ordinarily, to one floor: and so our ancestors once understood the word. Viewed etymologically, a *compartment* is one of several parts making up a whole, and may, therefore, be used to

Sir Thomas Elyot has even “diseases . . . against *whom*.” *The Governour*, fol. 150. And Shakespeare makes *whom* the relative of *elements*. *Tempest*, Act 3, Scene 2. “Eyelids *who*” and suchlike phrases are common in Shakespeare. Dr. Johnson refers *whom* to a *fowl*, and *who* to an *insect*. *Rasselas*, ch. 1; *Rambler*, No. 93.

¹ *Works* (ed. 1863), Vol. 2, p. 238, foot-note.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 14, p. 458, foot-note.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 10, p. 11; Vol. 11, pp. 62, 66; Vol. 13, p. 241. In *Klosterheim* (ed. 1832), p. 28, the “absurd” use of the singular *apartment*, for ‘room’, also has the authority of Mr. De Quincey.

⁴ It is so defined in Miegé’s *Great French Dictionary*, 1687-8. M. Littré calls this sense vicious.

describe any room belonging to a set, just as well as any set of rooms among those which compose a house. That which is by itself is *à part*, or 'apart'; and, hence, *apartments* and *compartments* differ, in suggesting aggregates under the aspects, as concerns their constituents, of disjunction and conjunction, respectively. But, as the rooms of a suite, no less than a suite itself, may be regarded singly, our modern use of *apartment* has nothing "absurd" in it. That it arose as Mr. De Quincey asserts is very questionable; it being much more likely that it descended to lodging-house keepers than that it ascended from them. As to its being "a mere vulgar error", or "absurd", who but Mr. De Quincey so esteems it? His "correct expression" is, probably, one of which he enjoys almost the monopoly; unless unidiomatic translators from the French share it with him. His adjudication is, here, irrespective of usage, and, by implication, sets up a standard which none but an autocrat is likely to acknowledge.

And then, what though the French idea of an *apartment* differs from our own? If people who only smatter French fancy themselves masters of it, and fall into "total misconceptions", shall we Gallicize our language, just to prevent such a calamity? Why should "the continental use" of a word be our use, the word having become English? *Apartment* is no longer *appartement*, even as *alter* is not *altérer*. Finally, if *apartment*, for 'room', be "absurd", *funeral*, for our ancient *funerals*, from the still existent *funerailles*, is no entire word, but only a verbal clipping.

Of *civilian* Mr. De Quincey says:¹

¹ *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 79, foot-note. In Vol. 5, p. 133, foot-note, we are told of "the ridiculous abuse of this word *civilian*, in our days."

"Nobody in the world," says Mr. De Quincey, . . . "has less sympathy than myself with idle cavillers, or less indulgence towards the scruples which grow out of excessive puritanism in style." Vol. 5, p. 190. We may believe him; only he disliked, in others, that which was the express image of one of his own most marked peculiarities. He must have reckoned on great inattention, or ignorance, or servility, on the part of his readers, or on all three together.

In the spirit which led him to run amuck at *civilian*, he would have reclaimed *errant*, for *arrant*, and thus made it do double duty. His "*errant* charlatan and impostor,"—Vol. 5, p. 104, in the edition of 1863, and in two other English editions,—as he ought to have seen, is, to common apprehension, almost a tautology; for a charlatan and impostor could scarcely but *err*. When *errant*, as qualifying 'rogue', came to differ from *wandering*, the substitution of the spelling *arrant* was no worse than the change which the word